



United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov	

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,979	10/08/2003	Yong-Moon Choi	098390-32594	6473
26345	7590 11/02/2004	90 11/02/2004		INER
		GRIFFINGER & VECCHIONE	KUMAR, SH	AILENDRA
I RIVERFRONT PLAZA NEWARK, NJ 07102-5497		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1621	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/680,979	CHOI ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_			
		SHAILENDRA - KUMAR	1621				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communica or Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address				
THE - Exter after - If the - If NC - Failu Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) do period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute to reply within the set or extended period for reply will reply received by the Office later than three months after ad patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. TOFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a recation. ays, a reply within the statutory minimum of third the properiod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON, by statute, cause the application to become AE	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <u>08 October 2003</u> .					
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from consideration.					
Applicati	on Papers			•			
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the E	Examiner					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to	by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection	on to the drawing(s) be held in abeyar	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including th The oath or declaration is objected to b	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)[cuments have been received. cuments have been received in A the priority documents have been I Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachmen	t(s) .						
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔯 Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTo r No(s)/Mail Date 1/6/2004.	-948) Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152) 				

Application/Control Number: 10/680,979

Art Unit: 1621

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-31 are pending in this application.

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 1/6/2004 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Application/Control Number: 10/680,979

Art Unit: 1621

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis(US 6,613,908).

Instant claims are directed to a process of carbamoylating an alcohol using alkali metal cyanate and an acid in the presence of organic solvent.

Ellis is teaching a process of carbamoylation using alkali metal cyanate in the presence of an acid under unhydrous condition and using organic solvent, similar to those as claimed herein. See for example column 2, lines 8-15, column 3, lines 62-65, column 4, lines 44-49, column 5, lines 7-12 and lines 33-34. Note that various heterocyclic alcohols can also be carbamoylated, see column 2, line 56 through column 3, line 12. The difference between the reference and herein claimed process is that the reference has not carbamoylated particular compounds as claimed herein.

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the process of Ellis using starting material as claimed herein, with the reasonable expectation of achieving a high yield of product similar to those claimed herein, because the process per se is an analogous process, the conditions are similar, the solvents are similar, acids used are similar, absent evidence to the contrary. In re Durden Jr. et al. 226 USPQ 359.

6. US 4,147,716 is cited to show the state of the art.

Application/Control Number: 10/680,979

Art Unit: 1621

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHAILENDRA - KUMAR whose telephone number is (571)272-0640. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 8:00-5:30, Alt Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on (571)272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SHAILENDRA - KUMAR Primary Examiner Art Unit 1621

S.Kumar 10/28/04